

Date: Sun, 20 Mar 94 04:30:19 PST
From: Ham-Equip Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-equip@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Equip-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Equip Digest V94 #71
To: Ham-Equip

Ham-Equip Digest Sun, 20 Mar 94 Volume 94 : Issue 71

Today's Topics:

49 mhz. Radio Shack Conversion 6 Meters
 Computer controlled receiver
 Help! Help! Need FT-736R Mods!
 HT Opinions (2 msgs)
 HTX-202 mods? (2 msgs)
 Packet on old Military Radios
 Programmable Scanners (2 msgs)
 TX Amp for 20 mtrs QRP rigs.
 Wanted a power supply

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Equip-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Equip Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-equip".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 18 Mar 94 21:50:39 GMT
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!ciss!wtcp!blangos@uunet.uu.net
Subject: 49 mhz. Radio Shack Conversion 6 Meters
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I understand that a group of west coast hams have converted 49 mhz Radio Shack
walkie talkies to be able to use them on 6 meter repeaters. I would be
appreciate any information anyone has on the model of the radio and
how to do the conversion.

Bruce Langos N8CNZ

--

Bruce Langos
Workstation Products Division F&A

Bruce.Langos@wtcp.DaytonOH.NCR.COM
...!uunet!ncrcm!ciss!wtcp!blangos

Date: 18 Mar 94 15:23:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!
hamilton@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Computer controlled receiver
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

basilier@sps.mot.com (Erik Basilier) writes:

>I would like to be able to make relative signal strength measurements under
>computer control ...

>1. Do you know of any receiver or transceiver which allows an attached
> computer to retrieve a signal strength reading?

Yes, the new Yaesu radios will do that using their CAT (Computer Aided Transceiver) system. All you need in addition to the radio is the CAT-to-RS-232 interface (about \$100). I have the FT-990 but I believe you'll also see the same CAT functionality on the FT-890 and the FT-1000 and maybe other Yaesu radios (like the 840).

Here's what the manual says:

Sending the Read Meter command causes the computer to return a digitized meter deflection indication, between 0 and 0FFh (in practice, around 0F0h maximum). Four copies of this value are returned, along with one padding byte (0F7h) as follows:

Meter Byte	Meter Byte	Meter Byte	Meter Byte	0F7h
------------	------------	------------	------------	------

During reception, the signal strength deflection is returned. During transmission, the parameter represented by the reading returned depends on the setting of the METER switch.

>2. Any idea on how stable the readings would be with respect to time,
> temperature and other influences?

No, haven't tried it. But with Yaesu, you are talking about some quality stuff, so chances are it's pretty usable, I'd think.

Regards,

Doug Hamilton hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117

Date: Fri, 18 Mar 1994 23:22:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!
rouge!jpd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Help! Help! Need FT-736R Mods!
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Did you try archie? It should have found PC.USL.EDU:/pub/ham/ft736.zip
which has lots of mod info, mostly for pacsat use, but there is one
file about 2m RX coverage increase via adding a diode.

--
-- James Dugal, N5KNX Internet: jpd@usl.edu
Associate Director Ham packet: n5knx @k5arh (land), K0-25 (sat.)
Computing Center US Mail: PO Box 42770 Lafayette, LA 70504
University of Southwestern LA. Tel. 318-231-6417 U.S.A.

Date: Fri, 18 Mar 1994 23:30:16 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!aio!pat!sheppard@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: HT Opinions
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I realize there are many opinions...

Was just interested in what the net considers is a good HT.

Someone I know swears by one brand and swears at another.

I realize there are many things to consider, like what I would
be using it for, etc., but in terms of performance, quality,
and cost:

What's a good HT?

--
MAS sheppard@pat.mdc.com
Electrical Power Systems Analysis (713) 283-1281
McDonnell Douglas Aerospace, Houston TX, USA

Date: Sat, 19 Mar 1994 16:39:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: HT Opinions
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Mar18.233016.27596@aio.jsc.nasa.gov> sheppard@pat.mdc.com (Mark Sheppard) writes:

>I realize there are many opinions...

>

>Was just interested in what the net considers is a good HT.

>

>Someone I know swears by one brand and swears at another.

>

>I realize there are many things to consider, like what I would

>be using it for, etc., but in terms of performance, quality,

>and cost:

> What's a good HT?

A good HT is one that can withstand a 6 foot drop on concrete *repeatedly* without harm. A good HT is one that will operate reliably for years in a filthy, high vibration environment. A good HT is one that *always* has a clean output, or no output, regardless of battery condition. A good HT will operate in a high RF area without intermod or overloading. A good HT is one that's fundamentally intuitive to operate. In other words, a good HT is a GE Mastr, or Motorola HT220. All others are varying degrees of *bad* HT. (Though an Icom IC2AT comes close to being a good HT.)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 19 Mar 1994 15:58:36 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!po.CWRU.Edu!sne@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: HTX-202 mods?

To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I was wondering if there are any mods for the Radio Shack HTX-202?

I love the radio but would like some extended rx. It would be nice

to be able to hear NWS 162.55 in this area. Thank you

Date: Sat, 19 Mar 1994 12:53:02

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!

ornews.intel.com!ccm.hf.intel.com!brett_miller@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: HTX-202 mods?

To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <2mf7fc\$3r1@usenet.INS.CWRU.Edu> sne@po.CWRU.Edu (Steven N. Emancipator) writes:

>I was wondering if there are any mods for the Radio Shack HTX-202?
>I love the radio but would like some extended rx. It would be nice
>to be able to hear NWS 162.55 in this area. Thank you

There are no frequency expanding mods for this radio. Its excellent RF performance is mostly due to the fact that the RF circuits were designed for Ham band only.

Brett Miller N70LQ
Intel Corp.
American Fork, UT

brett_miller@ccm.hf.intel.com

Date: Tue, 15 Mar 94 02:05:42 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!utnut!nott!cunews!revcan!rubicon!pilate!
dave@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Packet on old Military Radios
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Has anybody out there ever connected a TNC to a PRC-77 (manpack) or RT-524 (veh mounted) VHF Military radio. I have to do just this and would really appreciate some advice. I understand the interface is nu as Mil-Spec as one would think.

Thanks
DAve

--
Dave Mercer VE3XMJ | If Voting could change the system
work: mercer@dgs.dnd.ca | it would be illegal
home: dave@pilate.rubicon.org |

-----BEGIN PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK-----
Version: 2.3a

mQCNAiw7jJkAAAEALpAIvULlA/xvzruR30NcLZE0HCHyGm5QR4ej8xM6k3AcH3T
Q3NkgV2FK5f8t/fBAh01+ffa5K7F10B4hPqKKAASN1k1PIx9ty5oUgxAlZnfya4V
ScNIx0x2h2f3roRjiZLfNYM2zkm26sZhFQjVJxyNnluJq/xVb45/LyY+p9f1AAUR
tCBEYXZpZCBNZXJjZXIjPG1lcmNlckBuY3MuZG5kLmNhPg==
=0azF

-----END PGP PUBLIC KEY BLOCK-----

Date: 19 Mar 1994 03:12:29 -0800
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.kei.com!hookup!news.sprintlink.net!connected.com!connected.com!not-for-
mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Programmable Scanners
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

can anybody recommend a good budget version of a portable
scanner? I'm always seeing them at Radio Shack on sale for
like \$89 or \$99 for Realistic brands. Is there a less
expensive brand that with same(or better) quality?

Date: Sat, 19 Mar 1994 12:49:27
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!galaxy.ucr.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.umbc.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!ornews.intel.com!
ccm.hf.intel.com!brett_miller@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Programmable Scanners
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <2memmt\$ks3@hebron.connected.com> kerhop@hebron.connected.com (Unknown)
writes:

>can anybody recommend a good budget version of a portable
>scanner? I'm always seeing them at Radio Shack on sale for
>like \$89 or \$99 for Realistic brands. Is there a less
>expensive brand that with same(or better) quality?

Unless you buy them used, \$89 is rock bottom. I would suggest getting one
with a full frequency display. The model with only two digits gets very
annoying. Also, dont get one with less than 20 channels or you will outgrow
it too quickly. Scanner quality from \$89 to \$200 doesn't change much. They
all do the job reasonably well. You are mostly paying for the features.

Brett Miller N70LQ
Intel Corp.
American Fork, UT
brett_miller@ccm.hf.intel.com

Date: 20 Mar 94 04:08:17 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!coyote.rain.org!coyote!

leigh@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: TX Amp for 20 mtrs QRP rigs.
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

asirene@ntuvax.ntu.ac.sg writes:

>Hi,

> Need recommendation for a small TX amp kit which takes about 4 watts output from my QRP rig and puts out 20-30 watts with
>built in T-R switching (preferably solid-state T-R) and runs off 12-13.8v DC power supply. Must be small so I can fit it into my
>existing rig's casing. Should be something similar to the QAMP-20 from Ramsey Hobby kits. BTW, this is for 20 meters. Tks.

>73,
>Daniel

Daniel, if you stumble upon a small CB ampfier, you might try using it with your 20 meter QRP rig. Many of these amps are very broad banded, if sometimes somewhat dirty. I know of a local ham who sometimes steps up his 5 watt Ten Tec rig to about 50 watts on 40 meters, using a CB amp.

--Leigh/KM6JE.

Date: Tue, 15 Mar 1994 23:24:42 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!victorc@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Wanted a power suppely
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

I am looking for a power supply for my HF rig 20A-40A voltage adjustable.

Victor Chen (BV2CH)

Date: 19 Mar 94 23:38:33 GMT
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!hamilton@yale.arpa
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <2m58sq\$12hg@watnews1.watson.ibm.com>, <2mfkd6\$8p4@apple.com>, <19MAR94.18754189.0121@UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA>
Subject : Re: FT-990 vs TS-850

NAD0000 <NAD0@UNB.CA> writes:

>I don't think one should pick a radio just on looks. I have an
>850S-AT with the optional 1.8 SSB filter and enjoy a lot of low band
>work (160 and 75m) I tried a friend's Yeasu 890AT for two weeks,
>side by side, using a Daiwa switch in reverse and did a lot of
>*listening* (as opposed to *seeing*) switching rapidly from one
>radio to the next. The Kenwood 850 is a lot "noisier", i.e., the
>human voice is not clearly separated from the background noise,
>unless you cut back considerably on the RF gain. With the Yeasu, it
>is seldom necessary to play with the RF gain.

>A friend has both the Yeasu 757 and a Kenwood 440AT and he confirms
>the same findings. The Yeasu is more pleasant to listen to and most
>of us do a lot more listening than talking. My next rig is likely to
>be a Yeasu.

>The above impression is about SSB reception only. I have not tried
>anything else really. ...

I have an FT-990 that I bought about 2 months ago after a *lot* of
time spent soliciting opinions, reading reviews (if you're thinking
of buying a radio and haven't yet bought the two volumes of collected
QST reviews that the ARRL offers, you should!), and sitting in front
of the units I was considering at the local Ham Radio Outlet.

I'm very pleased with the 990. I haven't tried transmitting anything
yet (I just took and passed my Novice, Tech, General and Advanced tests
about 5 weeks ago and am still waiting for my ticket) but have spent
a lot of time listening. I'll confirm that the the 990 is a very
pleasant radio to listen to. On CW, it's terrific. The built-in
audio filters allow you to zero right in on a signal.

Regards,

Doug Hamilton hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117

Date: Sat, 19 Mar 1994 21:21:53 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!csd.unb.ca!
UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <2m4sff\$423@doc.cc.utexas.edu>, <2m58sq\$12hg@watnews1.watson.ibm.com>,
<2mfkd6\$8p4@apple.com>
Subject : Re: FT-990 vs TS-850

In article <2mfkd6\$8p4@apple.com> kchen@apple.com (Kok Chen) writes:
>>didn't give me a single problem, nor to anybody of my

>>friends, who seeing my 990 chose to buy similar rig
^^^^^^^^^^

I don't think one should pick a radio just on looks. I have an 850S-AT with the optional 1.8 SSB filter and enjoy a lot of low band work (160 and 75m) I tried a friend's Yeasu 890AT for two weeks, side by side, using a Daiwa switch in reverse and did a lot of *listening* (as opposed to *seeing*) switching rapidly from one radio to the next. The Kenwood 850 is a lot "noisier", i.e., the human voice is not clearly separated from the background noise, unless you cut back considerably on the RF gain. With the Yeasu, it is seldom necessary to play with the RF gain.

A friend has both the Yeasu 757 and a Kenwood 440AT and he confirms the same findings. The Yeasu is more pleasant to listen to and most of us do a lot more listening than talking. My next rig is likely to be a Yeasu.

The above impression is about SSB reception only. I have not tried anything else really. To be fair, the 850SAT is a little better at avoiding strong QRM, but in practice this was not very important, through the 2 weeks I tried both rigs. The 850SAT is also a quicker rig to utilize and its tuner is faster. My 2 year-old rig has not had a single problem since I bought it new.

Luis Nadeau VE9LN
>.

Date: 19 Mar 94 19:39:18 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <2m4s8t\$3vq@doc.cc.utexas.edu>, <2m4sff\$423@doc.cc.utexas.edu>,
<2m58sq\$12hg@watnews1.watson.ibm.com>
Subject : Re: FT-990 vs TS-850

uri@watson.ibm.com (Uri Blumenthal) writes:

>In article <2m4sff\$423@doc.cc.utexas.edu>, kreblon@doc.cc.utexas.edu (Bob Nagy) writes:

>> Ken..I own the 850..The reliability is better on the 990...

>I beg to differ! I'm quite pleased with the reliability of
>my FT-990 <knock-knock on the wood! :-> 'cause so far it
>didn't give me a single problem, nor to anybody of my
>friends, who seeing my 990 chose to buy similar rig

>for themselves.

Don't get too excited :-), you both said the same thing!

I also run an FT-990, for over a year now, I think. Not a single problem so far.

I use the Yaesu side by side with an Ten-Tec Omni V and actually prefer the FT-990 over the Omni for all modes except CW. If you know the Omni, that is saying a lot. Very sweet rig.

73,

Kok Chen, AA6TY kchen@apple.com
Apple Computer, Inc.

Date: 20 Mar 1994 03:45:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!news.ans.net!newsgate.watson.ibm.com!
watnews.watson.ibm.com!watson.ibm.com!uri@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <2m58sq\$12hg@watnews1.watson.ibm.com>, <2mfkd6\$8p4@apple.com>,
<19MAR94.18754189.0121@UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA>
Reply-To : uri@watson.ibm.com
Subject : Re: FT-990 vs TS-850

In article <19MAR94.18754189.0121@UNBVM1.CSD.UNB.CA>, NAD00000 <NAD0@UNB.CA>
writes:

> >>didn't give me a single problem, nor to anybody of my
> >>friends, who seeing my 990 chose to buy similar rig
> ^^^^^^^
> I don't think one should pick a radio just on looks.

Come on, don't you really understand, that "seeing" in the
context meant they tested it in all the modes they wanted?

If it was a joke - I apologize.

(:-).

--
Regards,
Uri. uri@watson.ibm.com scifi!angmar!uri

<Disclaimer>

End of Ham-Equip Digest V94 #71
